

PATENT APPLICATION
DOCKET NO.: 10012773-1

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending, of which claims 1, 10, and 14 are in independent form. Claims 10, 13, and 14 are currently amended. No new matter is introduced.

Favorable reconsideration of the present patent application as currently constituted is respectfully requested.

Regarding Amendments to the Specification

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's diligence in finding certain typographical errors with respect to some of the reference numerals provided in the specification. Accordingly, certain paragraphs of the specification have been amended as set forth above to address the minor informalities identified in the outstanding Office Action.

Further, responsive to the objection raised with respect to the Arrangement of the Specification, Applicant respectfully submits that the guidelines for section headings provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.77(b) merely set forth a preferred layout and are therefore permissive rather than mandatory. See MPEP 608.01(a). The comment that the disclosure does not "include a Detailed Description of the Invention section" is unwarranted. The present disclosure in fact includes a DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS,

PATENT APPLICATION
DOCKET NO.: 10012773-1

starting from page 5, line 27 through page 21, line 4. It is believed that the section heading of DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS in the present patent application is in accordance with the prevailing patent practice. Even a mere cursory examination of the USPTO database reveals that a huge number of issued patents have the section heading of DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS in lieu of DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION in their disclosure regardless of the technical field of the subject matter. See, e.g., U.S. Patent Nos. 6,717,443; 6,476,645; 6,807,595; and 6,805,202. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully contends that the pending objection to the disclosure on this basis is without merit and should therefore be withdrawn.

Regarding the Claim Objections

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 10, 13, and 14 are objected to because of certain informalities. The following comments were provided in this regard:

As per claim 10 in page 26 line 7 the word "if" is suggested to be changed to "when".

As per claim 13 in page 27 line 12 the word "if" is suggested to be changed to "when".

As per claim 14 in page 28 line 11 the word "if" is suggested to be changed to "when".

Appropriate correction is required.

PATENT APPLICATION
DOCKET NO.: 10012773-1

Applicant respectfully traverses this objection and requests the Examiner to provide the basis as to why the word "if" is objected to as being informal. As the Examiner is amply aware, "if" is a proper English word, and it is believed that there is no prohibition against its usage in claims, either under the patent statute, patent rules or the MPEP. Additionally, it is rather common to use the word "if" in claims where the context of the recited language allows such use. See, e.g., U.S. Patent Nos. 6,744,868 and 6,738,379. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Regarding the Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication in the outstanding Office Action that the present application with the pending claims 1-19 is in condition for allowance.

PATENT APPLICATION
DOCKET NO.: 10012773-1

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding objections with respect to the claims 1-19 presented for reconsideration herein and advance the present patent application towards a favorable action in the form of an early notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

11/16/04

Shreen K. Danamraj

Shreen K. Danamraj
Registration No. 41,696

DANAMRAJ & YOUST, P.C.
Premier Place, Suite 1450
5910 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75206
Tel 214.750.5666
Fax 214.363.8177